4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

III

Conversion and Religious Divisions

175* 186 797 While conversion to Christianity was an inevitable phase of the process by which the Slavs were drawn into the general movement of European civilization, it was by no means an unmixed blessing. When Slavic tribes had evolved to some semblance of national consciousness and even statehood, or were sufficiently remote from the center where religious influence was exempt from political pressure, they were able to retain their independence and to follow a characteristic course of development. But if they lived on the periphery of a powerful and aggressive Christian state, their political independence was frequently threatened, and if this state cherished colonial aims, the convert Slavs were very likely to face the choice between assimilation and enslavement, or, at the very worst, complete extermination.

797 795 178 779 191 175* The section of the medieval church which brought about the conversion was also a factor of durable historical weight. The Western Church was devoted to the tradition of Latin culture. It insisted on the celebration of the Mass in the hallowed language of the Church. Hence it evinced little concern for the creation of any vernacular culture. Though not possessed of the same vitality, the Eastern Church soon found that it could evangelize the various pagans on the long Byzantine frontier more effectively if it allowed them to use their native languages

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

in the service. Hence, though much of early south or east Slavic literature is either translated or imitated, the fact remains that the Slavs under Byzantine intellectual and religious influence developed significant national cultures much more rapidly than those under the domination of Rome. That these cultures, after a brilliant initial spurt, were later retarded and even brought to a halt which lasted several centuries is due, not to the source of conversion itself, but to historical accidents which supervened after conversion took place. Had not the Eastern and the Southern Slavs fallen victims, in one case to Tartar invasion and in the other to Turkish conquest, their intellectual lag in comparison with the rest of Europe would not have been so great. The Russians, for example, were completely deprived of all Western stimulation after the middle of the thirteenth century and nearly three hundred years elapsed before they entered upon the difficult process of assimilating the Western culture which had developed during that long and critical interval. The South Slavs, on the other hand, shook off the Turkish yoke only within the last century and thus were even more handicapped than the Russians in their struggle to catch up with the modern world.

Of all the Slavs, the Slovenes in Carinthia and Carniola were the first to encounter missionary activities. Early in the seventh century, they had been temporarily combined with Czechs and Sorbs north of the Danube in the semilegendary kingdom under Samo, who led them victoriously against the Avars and simultaneously offered a temporary barrier to Frankish expansion southward. During his declining years in Switzerland, Saint Columban, the great Irish missionary, had thought, as early as 612, of setting out from Bregenz on a mission to the nearest Slavs, but, finding the task too difficult for his advanced age (he was already sixty-nine), he retired to Italy and ended his days at Bobbio.

After Samo disappeared from the scene and his realm was dissolved, the Slovenes were unable to withstand the Avars, who soon held the Danube as far as the Enns. The Slovenes

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

thodius became abbot of the monastery of Polychron, in the vicinity of Mount Olympus.

The two brothers were recalled from their retirement by Michael III when Rostislav's mission asked for Slavic-speaking priests. Constantine in particular had demonstrated considerable linguistic talent on his mission to Khazaria, where he had learned Hebrew, and it is certain that both brothers spoke the Bulgarian dialect which prevailed in the environs of their native city. Upon accepting the mission, and before proceeding to Moravia, Constantine invented a Slavic alphabet, and translated into the Slavic dialect he knew a selection of passages from the Gospels.

This translation is the beginning of all Slavic literature, but the nature of the alphabet invented by Constantine is questionable. We have, as it happens, two early Slavic alphabets, the so-called Glagolitic, somewhat enigmatic in origin, and the Cyrillic, which is a combination of the Greek and Latin alphabets with some additions for specifically Slavic sounds. This latter is the ancestor of the modern Russian, Serbian, and Bulgarian scripts. On account of the difficulty of the Glagolitic, it was later supplanted in Bulgaria by the Cyrillic, which is relatively close to the Greek. On purely psychological grounds, but in utter disagreement with many much more authoritative teachers and colleagues, I believe that the priority belongs to Cyrillic, since Constantine would (I assume), if only for reasons of convenience, have used an alphabet as close as possible to the one with which he was most familiar. Then later in Moravia, when he found that the German clergy viewed with suspicion and hostility everything Greek, I believe that he devised the tricky and crabbed Glagolitic, which does not resemble Greek script at all, to disarm his opponents.

Accompanied by a few Greek priests who also knew Slavic, Constantine and Methodius arrived in Moravia during the spring of 863. They were well received by Prince Rostislav,

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

fortunes, not only threw off even the vestiges of a Byzantine protectorate but also extended its domain far into Serbia. During this interval Clement's activity greatly expanded. He founded the great monastery of Saint Panteleimon at Okhrida, and on Simeon's accession he was consecrated a bishop. The legacy of Constantine and Methodius was thus preserved in all its wealth, to the great advantage of Bulgaria, which thus became a purely Slavic country with an autonomous church. Simeon was accordingly able to realize his father's ambition of proclaiming a Bulgarian patriarchate.

Obviously the roots of the culture disseminated by the Bulgarian church, however nationalistic, were essentially Byzantine. Though a Slav by birth, Clement himself had been trained by Greek masters, and Simeon too was culturally so Hellenized as to be nicknamed the "half-Greek." Hence the literary productions of the Macedonian schools founded by Clement and his associates were, if not mere translations, usually slavish imitations of Greek texts. Simeon himself composed an anthology of texts compiled from Greek theologians. Though the influence of Byzantine letters during this epoch was limited to the theological and the liturgical sphere, it is of relatively enormous significance that at the end of the ninth century and the beginning of the tenth the Old Bulgarian language was being adopted for literary purposes under Greek influence, and that a large body of Slavic-speaking priests was being created who were capable of transmitting at least the ecclesiastical aspects of Greek culture in their own tongue. The mission of Constantine and Methodius thus bore fruit, not on the ground they themselves sowed, but on territory closer to Byzantium, so that the results of what their disciples accomplished in Bulgaria could be easily drawn upon seventy-five years later when a much more extensive field was opened with the conversion of the south Russian principality of Kiev.

At the same time, the Slavic liturgy which had been proscribed in Moravia was also transmitted through Pannonia into Croatia, but in general the popes saw no reason to use it

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

attained by every individual, nevertheless produced some admirable characters among early medieval churchmen and laymen.

The sources from which Vladimir drew his clergy present a problem of some importance and complexity. Adequate evidence exists that Greek priests were sent to Russia both in the suite of the Princess Anna and after her marriage to Vladimir. Since there were isolated Christians and at least one church at Kiev prior to Vladimir's conversion, there must have been a small nucleus of Russian-speaking clergy in the city itself before 989, though these clerics were probably of Greek nationality. Vladimir's well-attested activity in wholesale conversion even among the masses at widely separated points makes it likely, however, that some provision was made for evangelizing the people in a language comprehensible to them. Priests with the appropriate linguistic qualifications could be found at this period only among members of the Byzantine clergy who had been active in Bulgaria or among the Bulgarian clergy themselves, since the differentiation between the spoken languages of Bulgaria and south Russia in the late tenth century was so slight as to constitute no barrier to common understanding.

The tradition of vernacular religious culture under Greek intellectual auspices had been established in Bulgaria during the reigns of Boris (852-889) and Simeon (894-927). In the light of the eventual transmission to Kiev of a large body of ecclesiastical literature in Old Bulgarian translations, it is an accepted and doubtless correct convention of Russian literary history in the pre-Tartar period to assume that these works were first transmitted to Kievan Russia through the medium of Byzantium as priests were sent out into the Russian field. But, curiously enough, there are no historical data behind this respectable hypothesis, nor does any explicit evidence point to the slightest direct contact between the charges of Bulgaria and Russia during the principates of Vladimir and of his son through 1045.

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

While some ingenious theories to the contrary have been expounded, the fact remains that Byzantine relations with Bulgaria were constantly hostile from Vladimir's conversion to his death in 1015. Basil II would thus hardly have attached to an enemy state the young church founded by his brother-in-law. There is therefore no motive for believing that the Russian church at its foundation was other than an eparchy of the Byzantine patriarchate, even if we admit the contention that there was no metropolitanate in Russia during Vladimir's lifetime. In the transmission of Slavic liturgical and theological texts at this period the mediation of Constantinople was inevitable, and the priests at Vladimir's disposal must have likewise been chiefly Greeks, some of whom possessed a smattering of Bulgarian from work in Bulgaria itself or, like the proto-apostles Constantine and Methodius, from their contacts in the northern and western marches of the Byzantine Empire.

That Vladimir assimilated certain intellectual interests along with the faith is indicated by his insistence upon some degree of education among the children of his followers. The *Primary Chronicle* reports:

> *He took the children of the best families and sent them for instruction in book learning. The mothers of these children wept bitterly over them, for they were not yet strong in faith, but mourned as for the dead.*

It is not clear whether Vladimir intended that these youths should be trained as priests or as civil servants, but from the facts that within the next fifty years educated Russian priests come to the fore and that extensive reference is made in the sources to the culture of Vladimir's son and successor Yaroslav the Wise, it is fair to suppose that Vladimir had his eye on both professions. In Constantinople at the close of the tenth century interest in higher education was restricted by the general attention to military problems and conquest, so that book learning was primarily a matter of personal and private

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

study. It is therefore unlikely that Vladimir had before him any models calculated to inspire the establishment of schools in the modern or even the medieval sense of the word, but rather that he employed the priests sent from Byzantium as private teachers for the younger members of prominent families connected with his court.

At any rate, extant literary monuments dating from the last half of the eleventh century give evidence of an expanding nucleus of culture in Kiev itself which is the direct result of Vladimir's concern for education. It was hardly to be expected that a tremendous outburst of literary energy would ensue as soon as the seeds of learning were sown among a younger generation sprung from illiterate Varangian and Slavic sires, but the readiness with which Byzantine hagiographical and annalistic models were assimilated and imitated even before 1100 indicates an extensive interest in reading among circles brought up in a tradition of culture to the founding of which Vladimir contributed. That the basis of this culture was mere literacy—the ability to read the Psalms, the Gospels, and such Byzantine religious or historical compilations as had been translated into old Bulgarian in the days of Boris and Simeon—by no means lessens the importance of Vladimir's zeal for intellectual progress.

To Vladimir also belongs the credit for initiating the construction program which within the next century transformed Kiev into one of the most impressive medieval cities. The crowning structural exploit of Vladimir's reign was thus a stone church of the Virgin, begun in 989, for the erection and decoration of which he imported artisans from Greece. It was completed and consecrated in 996. At its dedication Vladimir endowed it with a tithe of his property and income, from which donation is derived its customary name, The Church of the Tithe, or *Desiatinnaia*. Originally a basilica, it was reconstructed with five cupolas after a fire in 1017, and collapsed under the weight of a crowd of refugees when the Tartars took

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

lar forms in vernacular letters, Russia was just recovering from the economically destructive and intellectually paralyzing effects of the Tartar conquest which had weighed the nation down since 1240. Medieval Moscow had nothing of the thirst for knowledge and the ambition for culture that inspired the foundation of German universities during the last half of the fourteenth century. It lacked the close contacts with Italy of the sixteenth which meant for Western Europe the infusion of art into literature and bore fruit in France in the works of Ronsard and the Pléiade or in England in the brilliance of Spenser and Sidney. This heritage was transmitted to Russia only in the eighteenth century as an element in the literary models and traditions then taken over bodily from the West.

Apart from the classical tradition of the Middle Ages and the revival of intellectual and artistic creative fervor during the Renaissance, there was a third important element in Western culture to which Russia was not directly exposed: the spirit of the Protestant Reformation. Russia had received the Christian faith from Byzantium. But the Eastern Orthodox and the Western Roman Catholic Churches were split by the schism of 1054, sixty-five years after the conversion of Kiev. The Eastern Church intensified its emphasis on mysticism and asceticism without the balance of social and cultural interests which fertilized the labors of the Roman Church in Western Europe. Then, after the contacts between the Russian Church and Constantinople became difficult because of precarious communication, and still more after the fall of the Byzantine Empire fifty years before Columbus discovered America, the church in Russia became petrified in dogma and sunk in debased formalism. It maintained no such tradition of learning, no such cult of scholastic philosophy as made the Roman Church a nucleus of productive thought even in those periods of European political history in which popular culture was at its lowest ebb. It was incapable of producing such bold and independent thinkers as a Wyclif, a Hus, a Luther, or a Calvin. Indeed, had such thinkers arisen, it is doubtful whether, even in the church or

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

178 among the limited section of the upper class which was literate, 179 there could have been found a receptive public in whom their ideas could have taken root.

178 Thus, when the Byzantine intellectual influence (such as it was) died away, the Russian Church lost its function as a repository of culture, and never regained it before it was reduced to social impotence in our own day by revolutionaries angered at its pernicious coöperation with the autocracy. Nor had there ever arisen in Russia any fruitful movement of inspired protest on theological grounds which opposed the spirit of individual critical intelligence to the inertia of a dogma-ridden hierachy. All three of these crucial factors in the formation of the Western European outlook (the perpetuation of classical culture in the Middle Ages; humanism and the Renaissance; the Protestant Reformation) fall quite outside the purview of Russian intellectual life until introduced as contributing elements of the Western culture imposed upon Russia by Peter and his successors in the course of the eighteenth century.

175* 177 When the Swedish warrior-merchants moved down the Russian watercourses, they established themselves as the economic and military ruling class in the small towns which the Eastern Slavs themselves had founded at strategic points for trade and defense. The impulse which first unified the Eastern Slavs into what eventually became the principality of Kiev resulted from the Varangian immigration, and though the immigrants were rapidly Russified by intermarriage with the native Slavs, the princes of Kiev still maintained intimate contact with Scandinavia. At the same time, their economic needs kept them in close relations with the Byzantine Empire for a century before the conversion of Kiev and for two centuries and a half thereafter.

177 643 Although Byzantine culture had its weaker aspects, we are too prone to underestimate its level and its service to the world, since nearly five centuries separate us from its collapse before the onslaught of the Turks. For while Western Europe was going through the painful process of civilizing the Germanic

4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

814 younger state in a volume which might have served as a firm
829 basis for the development of a characteristic native culture.
175* The Russians before the Tartar invasion were always pupils; they originated very little that was independent of Byzantine models either in literature or in art.

177 In art, however, this imitation was productive and created
341 an architectural and a decorative tradition which lasted down into modern times. By the date of Vladimir's conversion, the basilica as a type of church architecture in Byzantium had been largely replaced by the cruciform church with one or with five cupolas. This was the type transmitted to Russia and still worthily represented by the great medieval churches of Kiev, Novgorod, Vladimir and even Moscow, though in the metropolis the more exotic forms and the onion-shaped dome derived
177 from wooden architecture prevail. The highly conventionalized
532 art of the icon dominated Russian painting until Western influences began to seep in during the seventeenth century, but this tradition was still vital enough before the first World War to influence the art of nineteenth-century religious and historical painters. For where the Byzantine tradition had taken firm root, the aesthetic appeal was long-lived and enduring.

538 In literature, along with lapidary works of religious implica-
186 tion, the Russian national spirit began to manifest itself in historical compilations during the eleventh century, and literary reflexes of folk poetry had already appeared before the Tartar conquest. But a truly national literature stems from a long educative process, and this process was interrupted in medieval Russia both by domestic politics and by nomadic inroads.

177 Where domestic disorders merely retarded the intellectual
● 774 advance of medieval Russia, the Tartar incursion brought it to a full stop. It has already been noticed what material impoverishment it had caused. But the Tartar domination was a far more serious factor in the deterioration of cultural and spiritual values. The church, to be sure, was treated with tolerance by the Tartars because it preached submission to

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

of one day seeing Slavonic Christianity return to Catholic unity, and the immense flock of all the Russians come back to the Roman fold. As is well known, the critical point in dogma is the divergence between the two Churches regarding the procession of the Holy Ghost. It is the famous 'Filioque' quarrel. Now, in the Liturgy published by the Holy See in June, 1943, for the use of the Russians and Ruthenians, the *Credo* is given according to the version of the early centuries, without reference to the 'Filioque'—in other words, ignoring the chief dispute which separated the Orthodox from the 'Romans'.

In spite of these concessions, Orthodoxy has never given up. In Carpatho-Ruthenia the number of its followers doubled from 1921 to 1930. Moscow had nothing to do with this; at that time it was the Serbian Patriarchate which presided over the destinies of the Russo-Carpathian Orthodox Church.[1]

And, after the incorporation of the Eastern Marches of Poland and of Carpatho-Ruthenia in the Soviet Union, a counter-offensive for the return of the Uniats to Orthodoxy was organised, using the customary resources of Russian political power. On June 18, 1945, a Committee of Initiative was formed, with a view to winning over these Catholics to Pravoslav unity. A 'Council' of the Uniat Church of the Western Ukraine was held in Lwow on March 8, 1946; it proclaimed the dissolution of ties which, for 350 years, had bound that Church to the Vatican,[2] and its submission to the jurisdiction of the Russian Orthodox Church. In the name of the delegates of the three Uniat Eparchies which were represented at the Council, a message was sent to Stalin announcing this decision, and the breaking of the spiritual bond between the Eastern Catholics and Rome.

The Bulletin of the Moscow Patriarchate[3] commented on this event as follows: 'So, gradually, day by day, in union and in united prayer, will the breach opened by Rome within the ranks of the Orthodox clergy be closed; the time is not far distant

[1] In 1921 the figures for Ruthenia were: Catholics 55,000; Uniats 332,500, and Orthodox 60,997.

[2] The anniversary of the connection was commemorated by the encyclical letter *Orientales omnes ecclesias*, published on January 19, 1946, in which the Pope accused the Russians of treating the Catholic Ruthenians as enemies of the State and encouraged the latter to persevere in their traditional faith.

[3] February 6, 1947.

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

beyond the territories placed within its traditional sphere of influence, and especially in Czechoslovakia.

It is true that the saints given to the Church by the Czech nation in the tenth century appear both in the Orthodox and in the Roman calendars, but Orthodoxy disappeared as an official religion in the twelfth century. However, its influence did not completely disappear; it still had a latent existence in the time of John Huss and his disciples, who established relations with the Patriarchate of Constantinople in 1451—which relations were interrupted by the capture of the city by the Turks two years later.

With Joseph II's Edict of Tolerance in 1781, Orthodoxy, previously eliminated by the religious reaction known as the Counter-Reformation, re-established itself in Bohemia. We have related above (p. 24) the enthusiasm with which the people of Prague heard a Serbian prelate conduct an Orthodox service and pray for the soul of John Huss on the Wenceslas Square, on the occasion of the 1848 Slav Congress. In 1874 the use of the Catholic Church of Saint Nicholas was granted to the Orthodox cult, which thereafter worshipped in it concurrently with the National Church. After the Vatican Council, and in spite of the hostility of the Austrian authorities, conversions which created a great stir took place. But it was only after the First World War that the Orthodox Church was organised in Bohemia. Not being able, at that time, to attach itself to Moscow, it placed itself under obedience to the Serbian Patriarchate of Karlovtsi, which, in September, 1921, consecrated the first bishop. This Czech Orthodox Church was itself torn by the current of dissidence created by the 'Czechoslovak National Church', which claimed to be based on the ideas of John Huss, but was in reality far from being so. In 1929 the Patriarchate of Belgrade approved the constitution of an Orthodox Eparchy (Bohemia-Moravia-Silesia) in which divine worship was offered in liturgical Slavon and in Czech.

When the two Resistance heroes who were parachuted to deliver Bohemia from her torturer, the 'Protector', Reinhard Heydrich, had executed the latter,[6] they hid in the crypt of the

[6] The execution took place on May 27, 1942, on the outskirts of Prague, in a street which bore the symbolical name of Strossmayer. The practical details of the murder curiously resembled those connected with the

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

Church of St. Charles Borromeo, assigned to the Orthodox cult. They were discovered, and, after a regular siege, killed themselves rather than fall into the enemy's hands. The Orthodox Bishop Gorazd and his assistants, who had hidden them, were executed. And their church, which had just given marytrs to the national cause, was dissolved, and the cathedral turned into a shop.

After the liberation this church was restored to its rights and transferred (in April, 1946) from the jurisdiction of the Serbian Patriarchate to that of the Moscow Patriarchate, which raised Prague to the rank of an Archbishopric. On the following May 19 there arrived in the capital Mgr. Jelevferij, Exarch of the Patriarch of Moscow and Archbishop of Prague, who was received by the members of the Government and the Russian Orthodox Archbishop, Mgr. Sergej. The first service celebrated by the prelate was offered in memory of Bishop Gorazd.

In the following June Karpov, President of the Soviet's Council of State for Orthodox Affairs, gave a talk on 'Religion in Russia' to officers of the Czechoslovak Army, to emphasise the liberty of divine worship permitted under the Soviet régime, and the clergy's loyalty to the State.[7]

* * *

As in the time of the Tsars, Catholicism has again become the 'sore point' of the Slavonic community. Soviet Russia, which had so ostentatiously dissociated itself from the religious tradition of the Slavophiles, has rediscovered the latter on its line of expansion. The Kremlin has, by the force of circumstances, been obliged to play the Orthodox card in the regions placed within its sphere of influence. But action is followed by reaction. If Uniatism is retreating before Orthodoxy, Roman Catholicism represents, in Poland, in Slovakia, in Croatia, in Slovenia, a basis of resistance to Russian penetration in its twofold aspect of Marxism and schism. With the result that one would need the gift of prophecy to be able to say, today,

assassination of Francis Ferdinand in Sarajevo on June 28, 1914. Bishop Gorazd, Cikli, a parish priest, and Petzek, a curate, who sheltered the two heroes, were discovered on June 18.

[7] The reconstituted Hussite Church aspired to the role of an official Church; it held a Congress at the beginning of January 1946, and its Primate, M. Kovar, presented the new bishops to M. Benes on the 23rd of that month. The President advised him to co-operate with the other Churches of the West and the East, taking care, however, not to mix politics and religion. The Church numbers 850,000 members.

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

whether the gains which Orthodoxy confers on Soviet influence will or will not be offset by the opposition it revives or awakens.

The mind is struck by an anomaly—the cheerful alacrity with which the Orthodox hierarchy condemned régimes whose merits it had so often praised, and under which it had lived for so long. It is quite remarkable that, despite their national character, the Balkan Churches did not change their spiritual leaders at a time when the State was undergoing a political, social, and moral revolution. It would be possible to compile an 'Anthology of Repudiation' by publishing the speeches of the Patriarchs who have remained in office. To condemn the régime under which they were appointed, they have found as many arguments as they formerly invoked to justify it. It is true that the Orthodox Church is essentially more 'democratic' than the Roman Church. But this inconsequentiality on the part of its leaders has not increased its authority, any more than that of the Catholic hierarchy has been strengthened by the time-serving attitude of certain prelates towards the Hitlerian order.

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

fifth century manuscript of the Bible, known as Codex Alexandrinus which is one of the most precious treasures of the British Museum, was presented by Lucar to Charles I from the Library of Alexandria.

This strange figure of a Protestant Patriarch encountered violent opposition. Not only had he to face the solid uncompromising body of traditional Orthodoxy, he was met also by the bitter hostility of the Jesuits and of a Latinizing party within his own Church which had been formed by the proselytizing efforts of Roman Catholic missions. These were very active at the time, and enjoyed the support of France and Venice.

In 1629, Lucar published his celebrated *Confession*, a document which contained much Calvinist doctrine and inaugurated a controversy which was not settled until the Synod of Jerusalem in 1672. Lucar himself was strangled by order of the Sultan on a trumped-up charge which his enemies brought against him. Just how far Cyril Lucar himself was a "heretic" has been disputed. It has been maintained that he did not hold the doctrines attributed to him, and the assertion of the Synod of Jerusalem that he did not write the *Confession* has been repeated by modern writers.[1] A synod held at Constantinople the year after his death condemned both Lucar and the *Confession*; the following Synods of Jassy and Jerusalem the *Confession* only. What is certain is that the Orthodox Church rose in a body to repudiate Lutheran, Calvinist or any other sort of "Protestant innovations"—whether Lucar held them or not.

The Synod of Jerusalem (sometimes called the Synod of Bethlehem, because it was convoked from that place) is of very great importance. It was convened with the express purpose of condemning the *Confession* attributed to Lucar but in doing so it promulgated a positive affirmation of the faith of the Orthodox Church.[2] Its acts include a Confession of Faith which "is a closely knit, carefully worked out summary of theological doctrine, in its phraseology very strongly

[1] E.g., Mesolora, and others. See Gavin: *Greek Orthodox Thought*, footnote on pp. 214 ff.

[2] The Acts of the Synod of Justin, and Cyril's *Confession* may be found in English in J. N. W. B. Robertson: *The Synod of Jerusalem*, 1899.

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

779 impregnated with scholastic terminology and in the exactness of its language and dialectical distinction refreshingly clear and lucid."[1] It is known as the *Confession of Dositheus* and is one of the "Symbolic Books" of Orthodoxy.

There are important doctrines of the Church, such as the theology of Grace, the Church, the Sacraments, and Justification, which were not dealt with in the seven Ecumenical Councils and upon which Orthodoxy made its pronouncements after the Schism, and mainly in the synods of the seventeenth century when the need arose for the Orthodox Church to define its position in relation to the teaching of the West, both Roman Catholic and Protestant.

The Symbolic Books of Orthodoxy are expositions of the belief of the Orthodox Church written by various authors on various occasions which called for them, and subsequently recognized by ecclesiastical authority.

The teaching of these books, though not on the level of the decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, are received throughout Orthodoxy as of very great authority, particularly because they are held to express nothing which is not consonant with the Ecumenical Councils and the writings of the Fathers. There are five Symbolical Books, and with the exception of the first they all came into being as a result of the Reformation. They are:

1. *The Confession of Gennadius Scholarius.* This was written by the Gennadius who became Patriarch of Constantinople in 1454. He wrote it as an exposition of the Christian Faith for the use of Moslems.

2. *The Three Answers of the Patriarch Jeremiah II* (1576, 1579, 1581). These are the Orthodox side of a correspondence between Jeremiah, Patriarch of Constantinople, and certain Lutheran theologians of Tübingen who brought him a Greek translation of the *Confession of Augsburg* and suggested negotiations with a view to reunion.

3. *The Confession of Metrophanes Kritopoulos.* Before Kritopoulos became Patriarch of Alexandria in 1630, he travelled in Germany and England (see page 86). While in Helmstadt in 1625 he wrote this *Confession*, setting forth the

[1] Gavin, p. 216.

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

tenets of the Orthodox Church as compared with both Roman Catholicism and Protestantism, for the benefit of his Lutheran friends who had asked him to do so. 779 •

4. *The Orthodox Confession of Mogila.* Peter Mogila was Metropolitan of Kiev, 1632–46. His *Confession* is written in catechetical form, and received the approval of more than one synod. It was revised and in its final form has the signatures of the Four Patriarchs and many other hierarchs.

5. *The Acts of the Synod of Jerusalem* (1672) and *the Confession of Dositheus* which was promulgated with them. Dositheus was the Patriarch of Jerusalem at the time and he presided at the Council. This Synod of Jerusalem (or Bethlehem) was the most important of the group of synods which were convened as a result of the alleged *Confession* of Cyril Lucar (see page 87). There were three others beside Jerusalem, i.e., Constantinople (1638) Jassy (1641) and Constantinople (1672).

The Synod of Jerusalem is of great significance for the modern exposition of the faith of the Orthodox Church, and it will be of interest to look at its proceedings more closely. The Synod was concerned in the first place to assert that Cyril Lucar did not write the *Confession* attributed to him, and to support this contention by citations of other utterances which were undoubtedly his and were, in the view of the Synod, inconsistent with passages in his alleged *Confession*.

Nevertheless, so eager was the Synod to repudiate the teaching of this document and to deny that it expressed the teaching of the Orthodox Church, that it incorporated in its own Acts those of the Synod of Constantinople in 1638, which had anathematized Cyril by name. This was done on the ground that Cyril had survived the publication of the *Confession* for six years, and yet had not written against it, although he had often been begged to do so. His verbal repudiation of certain passages in the *Confession* were held to be insufficient, and the Synod of Jerusalem confirmed his condemnation "if he was, indeed, a heretic and did not repent."

The Synod refers all who wish to know what the Orthodox Church teaches to the Answers of Jeremiah and the *Confession* of Mogila, and then adds its own exposition of the faith. This

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples E/L

779 is the *Confession* of Dositheus, which takes the form of 18 decrees and 4 questions dealing one by one with the 18 chapters and 4 questions of Cyril's *Confession*, in conjunction with which therefore they should be read to be fully understood. The *Confession* of Dositheus bears seventy signatures beside his own.

The first of the Decrees is a brief statement of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. "Cyril" had said that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father through the Son.[1] The second deals with the Holy Scriptures, which ought to be believed "without doubting yet not otherwise than the Catholic Church hath interpreted and delivered the same."[2] Then follow Decrees which state the Orthodox doctrine as opposed to Lutheranism and Calvinism on such matters as Predestination, Original Sin, and Free Will. "We believe the most good God to have from eternity predestinated unto glory those whom He hath chosen, and to have consigned unto condemnation those whom He hath rejected; but not so that He would justify the one, and consign and condemn the other without cause. For that were contrary to the nature of God who is the common Father of all, and no respecter of persons, and would have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth; but since He foreknew the one would make a right use of their free-will, and the other a wrong, He predestinated the one, or condemned the other." Decree 13 states very clearly the necessity of both Faith and Works: "We believe a man to be not simply justified through faith alone, but through faith which worketh through love, that is to say, through faith and works. But (the notion) that faith fulfilling the function of a hand layeth hold on the righteousness which is Christ, and applieth it unto us for salvation, we know to be far from all Orthodoxy." The Church is taught and illuminated by the Holy Spirit, not, however, immediately "but through the Holy Fathers and Leaders of the Catholic Church." (Decree 12.) Indeed "the dignity of the Bishop is so necessary in the Church, that without him, neither Church nor Christian could either be or be spoken of.

[1] The Synod of Jassy which also dealt with "Cyril's" chapters seriatim apparently takes this as equivalent to the *filioque*. Unlike Jerusalem, Jassy did not condemn Cyril personally, but only the alleged *Confession*.

[2] The quotations are from Robertson: *Synod of Jerusalem*, 1899.

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

For he, as a successor of the Apostles, having received in continued succession by the imposition of hands and the invocation of the All-holy Spirit the grace that is given him of the Lord of binding and loosing, is a living image of God upon the earth." (Decree 10.)

Decree 15 is concerned with the Sacraments and 16 and 17 with Baptism and the Eucharist in particular. The Sacraments, called "Mysteries" by the Orthodox, are seven in number, to accept any other number of sacraments is "heretical madness". They are: Baptism; Confirmation or Holy Chrism, which was instituted by the words "Tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem until ye be endowed with power from on high"; Holy Orders, which was instituted by the words "This do ye for my memorial" and the words "Whatsoever ye shall bind or loose upon the earth shall be bound or loosed in the heavens"; the Eucharist; Marriage; Penance; and Unction—"the Holy Oil or Prayer Oil is spoken of in Mark and is expressly witnessed to by the Lord's brother."[1] In general, the Sacraments have "something natural" and "something supernatural". They are not "bare signs of the promises of God", but "efficient means of grace to the receivers", and "we reject as something abominable and pernicious the notion that when faith is weak the integrity of the Mystery is impaired."

It is to be observed that the Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem, and particularly the 17th and 18th, carry what Neale called "a clear taint of Latinism". They belong to a period when the influence of Rome was strong in the Orthodox Church, and of all the authoritative formulae of Orthodoxy they reveal that influence at the highest. For instance, the 17th Article on the subject of the Eucharist uses the word transubstantiation and employs the terminology of substance and accidents. "We believe," it says, "the Lord Jesus Christ to be present, not typically, nor figuratively . . . but truly and really, so that after the consecration of the bread and the wine the bread is transmuted, transubstantiated, converted and transformed into the True Body Itself of the Lord which was born in Bethlehem of the ever-Virgin." "Further, we believe that after the consecration of the bread and wine there no

[1] St. Mark vi, 13. St. James v, 14.

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

• 779 longer remaineth the substance of the bread and the wine, but the Body Itself and the Blood of the Lord under the species and form of bread and wine; that is to say under the accidents of the bread." "Further, that the Body Itself of the Lord and the Blood That are in the Mystery of the Eucharist ought to be honoured in the highest manner, and adored with *latria*. For one is the adoration of the Holy Trinity, and of the Body and Blood of the Lord. Further, that it is true and propitiatory Sacrifice offered for all Orthodox, living and dead; and for the benefit of all, as is set forth expressly in the prayers of the Mystery delivered to the Church by the Apostles, in accordance with the command they received of the Lord. Further, that before Its use, immediately after the consecration, and after Its use, What is reserved in the Sacred Pyxes for the communion of those that are about to depart (i.e., the dying) is the true Body of the Lord, and not in the least different therefrom; so that before Its use after the consecration, in Its use, and after Its use, It is in all respects the true Body of the Lord." "Further, that this Mystery of the Sacred Eucharist can be performed by none other, except only by an Orthodox Priest who hath received his priesthood from an Orthodox and Canonical Bishop in accordance with the teaching of the Eastern Church."

The sacramental doctrine of the Orthodox Church is, therefore, the same as that of the Catholic West. But there is this important fact to be noted. This same 17th Decree expressly states that the word transubstantiation is used not to explain the manner of the change but to express and emphasize the reality of the fact of it. Gavin[1] quotes Chrysostom Papadopoulos as saying "the influence of Latin theology was entirely external and ought not to be over-emphasized. This superficial similarity of expression in its teaching ought not to be regarded as identity in thought." That is to say that the Orthodox use of the word transubstantiation to express the fact of the change need not be held to commit the Easterns to acceptance of the scholastic philosophy to explain the manner of the change.

It is significant that when the Acts of the Synod of Jerusalem were translated into Russian and published in 1838,

[1] p. 217, footnote.

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

considerable alterations in phraseology were made: the more obvious Latinisms and in particular the reference to substance and accidents were excised.[1] 779

The 18th Decree of the Synod of Jerusalem is concerned with the state of the departed and with prayers on their behalf. After death, souls enter into joy or misery according to their actions in this life. But neither the joy nor the misery is complete until after the General Resurrection. The souls of those who have sinned mortally but have repented before death, "though without bringing forth any fruits of repentance" descend into Hades and there endure punishment. "But they are aware of their future release from thence and are delivered by the Supreme Goodness through the prayers of the Priests and the good works which the relatives of each do for their Departed; especially the unbloody Sacrifice." The word Purgatory is not mentioned. The wording of this Decree is also slightly modified in the Russian version. And, indeed, the general conception which seems to control the Orthodox mind on this matter, is of the Church as the body of the faithful whose life is upheld by mutual prayer and intercession. The death of the body is irrelevant. All the departed, from the Blessed Virgin Mary to one's own parents may be prayed for, and prayed to. If a man can ask for the prayers of someone he knows on earth, there is no reason why he should cease to do so after that person has died, nor is his physical death any reason why he should cease to be prayed for.[2]

The Questions appended to the Decrees are the same as those attached to "Cyril's" *Confession*. 1. Ought the Divine Scriptures to be read in the vulgar tongue by all Christians? 2. Are the Scriptures plain to all Christians that read them? 3. What books do you call Sacred Scripture? 4. How ought we to think of the Holy Icons and of the Adoration of the Saints?

[1] See a translation of the Russian text with comparison with the Greek of Decree 17 in Neale: *History of the Holy Eastern Church*, London, 1850, Vol. II, p. 1173. And an interesting report of a conversation with Philaret of Moscow on the Russian use of the word transubstantiation in Headlam: *History, Authority and Archeology*, p. 199, note 2. London, 1909.

[2] See Khomyakov's well-known poem printed in Birkbeck: *Russia and the English Church*, Vol. I, p. 2. London, 1895.

10: French S-4 (no date) 1951 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

The Synod's Answer to the first three is that the Scriptures "should not be read by all but only by those who with fitting research have inquired into the deep things of the Spirit," and who understand how they should be read. The New Testament itself is quoted to shew that the Scriptures "are very profound and their sense lofty; and that they need learned and divine men to search out their true meaning." It is asserted that the Books of the Apocrypha are genuine parts of Scripture.[1]

In answer to Question 4, "Cyril" had said, ". . . We permit those that so desire to have icons of Christ and the Saints; but the worship and service of them . . . we reject." The Synod, however, gives an answer of some length and reasserts the doctrine of Icons affirmed by the Seventh Ecumenical Council (see p. 54) and refers to that Council by name. It draws a clear distinction between worship as *latria* which may be offered to God alone, and the *dulia* with which the Saints and their icons are adored, or rather, honoured. There is further a higher degree of *dulia*, called *hyperdulia* which is paid to the Blessed Virgin Mary, "the Mother of God the Word. For though, indeed, the Theotókos be servant of the Only God, yet it is also His Mother as having borne in the flesh one of the Trinity; wherefore also she is hymned as being beyond compare, above as well all Angels as as Saints; wherefore also we pay her the adoration of *hyperdulia*."

Finally the *Confession of Dositheus* appeals by name to a number of writers who have written expositions of the Orthodox Faith, to the Fathers, to the Ecumenical Councils, as expressing the same teaching as the Confession. And even the heretics, it says, Nestorians, Armenians, Copts and the Ethiopians, apart "from their own particular heresies" believe the same thing.

A few years before this Council of Jerusalem assembled, Macarius, the 147th Patriarch of Antioch, had returned from a journey to Moscow. It was his second visit to that city. He had been there before in 1655, when his son Paul, Archdeacon of Aleppo, had accompanied him, and kept a diary which is full of interest and at times diverting.[2] He made his journeys

[1] The Russian version omits this: and tones down somewhat the refusal of permission to all to read the Scriptures.

[2] Ridding: *The Travels of Macarius*. London, 1936.

5: Kemp E-4, 5 (1926-1933)1935
EF6 Serbs
Slavic Peoples E 16
Historical Bulgaria EE 2

SP 771 175

describe a number of local or tribal cults; nor is it justifiable to imagine a basis of a uniform primitive Slav system.

In the South, that is to say, in the Lower Danube basin and in Illyria, tradition ascribes the first conversions to Christianity to the time of Heraclius, and there seems not to have been the same fierce and prolonged opposition to the new cult, with which it had to contend in Russia and Northern Europe. In Russia and in Poland, a dual confession, and apparently a heathen priesthood, lasted into the later Middle Ages; in the eleventh to twelfth centuries attempts were made to re-establish the old faith on a national basis. True, the rising in Bulgaria against Boris (eleventh century) was led by an anti-Christian element, but we do not know of an active priesthood in this connection, nor whether it was a revival of Slavonic or Asperuh tendencies. Until the final establishment of a national, autonomous Church in Bulgaria, and in fact, until the turning-point of the Synod of Trnovo (seventeenth century), the indecision as to belief was evident not only in the varying allegiance to pope or patriarch, but in the activities of the numberless heretical sects, not merely tolerated, but at times enjoying considerable privileges and influence.

SP HB 669 795 779

SP 795 797

The presence of these sects, notably of a gnostic character, pre-dates the Orthodox missions of the tenth century, and caused their retreat from Pannonia. The earliest account of the Slav apostles mentions the 'thrice heathen heretics' who were unacquainted with Slavonic; probably referring to that mixture of Paulician and Eulite doctrine, which, since the fourth century, had spread into the Northern Balkans, and remains to this day among the Nazarenes of the trans-Danube. Syrian and Armenian colonies had been established in Thrace during the seventh century in the time of Constantine, still known to M. Psellos and Cedrenos as Massalians. Armenian Monophysites and Paulicians lived in the neighbourhood of Plovdiv, Sofia, Devol, Rila, Moglena, Kjustendil, etc., from the eleventh to the thirteenth century; the Dragovičci being known in South-east Macedonia as extreme

5: Kemp E-4, 5 (1926-1933)1935
EF6 Serbs
Slavic Peoples E 16
Great Russians RF 2

SP 938 795 171

early Russian chronicle attributes a very similar cosmogony to Volhs (*magi*) at Kiev, long before the first traces of Bogomil apocryphal literature in Russia.

The fact of the matter is, that most of the apocryphal literature, important for creating a new source of popular legend in the Balkans—e.g. the Apocalypsis of Baruch, Gospel of St Thomas, the Palaia, Vision of Isaiah, etc.—appeared in Slav versions, often markedly differing from any known Greek originals, as early as the eleventh century, and possibly before Bogomilism as such had established a popular hold or, at any rate, a literature of its own. To Jeremije, the Bogomil, is generally attributed the Slavonic version of the Elucidarium. Here, again, no exact Greek prototype can be discovered. Neither the devil's contract motif, nor that of his appearance over the primeval waters in the form of a diving bird, and other significant details, can be traced with any certainty beyond the Slavonic versions.

R SP 773 779

Only on going westwards into Bosnia, it seems certain that the literary form preceded the popularised story. Otherwise, it is clear that the Slav writers of the Middle Ages made considerable use of popular sources, unaware of any inconsistency of doctrine, and tempering their material to taste. In the beginning, according to a Russian monastic writer of the seventeenth century, Almighty God resided in the three chambers of the upper heaven. 'The three chambers of the cross,' he says, in iconographical symbolism. 'The Emperor without beginning, uncreated, unspeakable, not born, not conceived, universal, invisible and unseeable, immortal and immaterial' was there before time. By his thought he gave birth to his Son. 'For the Father is neither created nor begotten, and the Son is begotten and not created. The Holy

substantial history, but there is documentation in his *Jazyčestvo i drevnja Rus'* (1914), and in more recent articles in *Slavia* and *Revue des Études Slaves* (VIII). More relevant theories are put forward by M. Arnaudov in Sb.N.U. IV. Older works include Spicyn, *Šamanizm v otnošenii k russkoj arheologii*, Zapiski Arheolog. XI; V. Bogoraz, *K psihologii šamanstva* (Etnograf. Obozrenie, XXII, i), where traditions of the type given above will be found.

5: Kemp E-4, 5 (1926-1933)1935
EF6 Serbs
Slavic Peoples E16
Great Russians RF2
Historical Bulgaria EE2
Historical Yugoslavia EF2

Spirit is not created and not begotten, but proceeds from the Father. The Son of God created by his Word and the command of his heavenly Father all the creatures of heaven, visible and invisible. As he spoke, so it was created and made by the Holy Spirit proceeding from his wise lips....' This is the irreproachably Orthodox preface to a story of God and devil creation.[1]

A Bulgarian monk of the eleventh century (as Jireczek identifies him) wrote a world chronicle, which is preserved in a Serbian manuscript. It is an early naturalisation and adaptation of heterogeneous themes. Into the mouth of the prophet Isaiah is put a vision of the whole world, on an angel-borne journey to the seventh sphere of heaven. On the command of God, Isaiah gathered together the chosen people of the Bulgars on the north shore of the Black Sea and led them into the country now known as Dobrudja, where they settled and flourished and expanded their empire.[2] It appears that this is a Bogomil work, and thus bears out the theory that the sect tended to become a nationalist party in mediaeval Bulgaria.

Selective tendencies are not unimportant criteria at the time of contact with a different culture. The remarkable profusion of apocryphal books translated into Slavo-Serb and Bulgarian was not the work of a sect only. On the other hand, very little is known of Byzantine science or even history, which found its way into these languages. The most that remains is a few works on astrology and magic, and treatises on minerals and animals. There was a distinct taste for the fantastic and the magical, to judge from the literary remains of the earlier periods. 'I have travelled in many lands, but I have nowhere seen so many sorcerers as in our land of Bulgaria; nor so many witches and spell-workers, to whom people go to obtain cures from them,' says a writer of the seventeenth century. And in another place: 'There are men

[1] V. Močulskil, *Russkii Filolog. Vestnik*, XVII (1887).

[2] Cf. L. Stojanović, *Spomenik*, III (1890), pp. 160–93; K. Jireczek, *Sitzberichte d. kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, CXXXVI.